

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ DIVISION** (Mailed 3/21/2016)**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
for Approval of Modifications to its  
SmartMeter™ Program and Increased Revenue  
Requirements to Recover the Costs of the  
Modifications (U39M).

Application 11-03-014  
(Filed March 24, 2011)

And Related Matters.

Application 11-03-015  
Application 11-07-020

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO CENTER FOR ELECTROSMOG  
PREVENTION FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 14-12-078**

<b>Intervenor: Center for Electrosmog Prevention (CEP)</b>	<b>For contribution to Decision (D.) 14-12-078</b>
<b>Claimed: \$99,093.34</b>	<b>Awarded: \$32,088.50</b> (reduced 67.6%)
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Michael Picker</b>	<b>Assigned ALJ: ALJ Division<sup>1</sup></b>

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief description of Decision:</b>	This decision adopts fees and charges for residential customers in the service territories of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) who do not wish to have a wireless smart meter. This decision also grants authority for PG&E SCE, SDG&E, and SoCalGas to recover actual costs associated with providing the opt-out option up to the following amounts.
--	---

<sup>1</sup> This proceeding was originally assigned to Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Yip-Kikugawa.

**B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812:**

	<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference (PHC):	May 16, 2012	Verified.
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	June 11, 2012	Verified.
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes.
<b>Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):</b>		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.11-06-006 A.11-06-029 A.11-07-001	Verified.
6. Date of ALJ ruling:		
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	D.14-11-020	Verified.
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes.
<b>Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.11-06-006 A.11-06-029 A.11-07-001	Verified.
10. Date of ALJ ruling:		
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	D.14-11-020	Verified.
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes.
<b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.14-12-078	D.14-12-078
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	December 23, 2014	Verified.
15. File date of compensation request:	February 16, 2015	February 17, 2015
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes.

**C. Additional Comments on Part I :**

<b>#</b>	<b>Intervenor’s Comment(s)</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
	The Center for Electrosmog Prevention (CEP) is a California corporation and a 501c(3) nonprofit, working to improve	The Center for Electrosmog Prevention (CEP)’s customer status is confirmed in D.14-11-020.

	the public health through prevention and reduction of electrosmog, providing comprehensive information, prevention, solutions, and education regarding Electrosmog. CEP provides advocacy to reduce Electrosmog in the indoor and outdoor environment for individuals including but not limited to utility customers.	
--	---	--

## PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

### A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (*see* § 1802(i), § 1803(a), and D.98-04-059).

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
The Decision adopted some of CEP's recommendations including allowing ratepayers to choose to have an analog electric meter and to allocate the opt-out cost as overhead to the utility company. The Decision requires opt-out customers to pay fees for the first three years only and for the costs to be distributed over all the residential ratepayers thereafter. The Decision also adopted CEP's recommendations to reduce readings of the analog meters and estimate in between readings, in order to reduce costs. Thereafter, the Decision adopts CEP's recommendation not to charge any fees. But, the Decision doesn't credit CEP for recommending that action, it only mentions that CEP filed comments on the Americans with Disabilities		<i>See</i> Comment(s).

<p>Act, p. 60 and filed comments on the Proposed Decision, p. 68 without mentioning how the Commission used CEP's comments to write the Decision.</p> <p>Other parties (TURN, AGLET, ORA, and CforAT) were credited by name for their contributions and CEP's contributions to the socializing of the fees after three years were omitted. P. 72 mentions that CEP contributed to the revised Decision "regarding the proposed decision's determinations concerning whether the ADA or Pub. Util. Code § 453(b) limits the Commission's ability to adopt fees and charges for all customers who elect to participate in the opt-out option." However, CEP made the contributions by listing findings of the American Association of Environmental Medicine (<a href="http://www.aaemonline.org">www.aaemonline.org</a>) that issued a report finding that people do experience illness and discomfort from proximity to smart meters. This evidence was included in the CEP testimony and addressed in CEP's briefs and other documents filed in the proceedings. P. 66 of the Decision states that the CPUC evaluated the available evidence of health and safety effects by reviewing findings of courts and other agencies. But, the</p>		
---	--	--

<p>CPUC operates pursuant to the statutory mandate of California Public Utilities Code section 451 which requires the CPUC to issue decisions and orders only after evaluating whether they “are necessary to promote the safety, health, comfort, and convenience of its patrons, employees, and the public.” This authority does not allow the CPUC to ignore evidence in the record addressing its statutory mandate. CEP filed documents addressing all directives issued by the Commission throughout the proceedings and participated in the evidentiary hearings presenting the health evidence required for an analysis of the applicability of the ADA and PU Code section 453 to the CPUC regulated utility companies and so is requesting compensation for the time and expense of writing testimony and participating in the evidentiary hearings and writing and filing the other documents provided in these proceedings. The CPUC used this information because it has a statutory mandate to do so and yet CEP’s contributions weren’t listed in the Decision. If the Commission decides not to reimburse CEP for the portion of time allocated to health issues, CEP suggests reducing the amount requested for Cost</p>		
---	--	--

Allocation by 50%.		
1. Analog meter must be exclusively electromechanical, not electronic	CEP Testimony p. 5	<i>See Comments.</i>
2. No fees should be charged for opting out	Testimony p. 5 and opening brief, p.4, and reply brief	<i>See Comments.</i>
3. “The opt-out program costs should be included in the general rate case proceedings because it is an integral part of the Investor Owned Utility Companies (IOU) s utility services metering program and is not a new program incremental to the smart meter programs already established before this proceeding began”	CEP opening brief p. 6  Decision Ordering Paragraphs: 3,4,9,10,15,16 describe how the opt-out fees are included in the general rate case proceedings	<i>See Comments.</i>
3a. Cross Examination of Utilities’ witnesses demonstrate that meters don’t have to be read every month. This demonstrates that fees proposed are too high and can be reduced or eliminated.  CEP’s recommendation that the fees can be reduced or eliminated was subsequently accepted in the CPUC Decision.	Decision Ordering Paragraph 25.  Evidentiary Hearing Transcript November 6, 2012: CEP cross:  p. 38 - 39, and 115  Transcript November 7, 2012:  p. 163, lines 9 - 27  p. 208 lines 14 - 24  p. 209, lines 4 -  p. 269, lines 7 -  p. 294, lines 4 -  Transcript November 8, 2012:  p. 510 line 24 through p. 517, line 7 PG&E’s witness Meadows  p. 575, <i>et seq.</i> Asking SCE witness, Lawrence Oliva, about socializing meter reading costs by charging all rate payers the same amount.  p. 585, line 5 - p. 587 line 9, about self-reading meters SCE says that self-reading doesn’t save money	<i>See Comments.</i>

	<p>because of back-office costs</p> <p>p. 587 line 10 - p. 590, line 13 asking about locating meters off-premise to reduce EMF emissions in the residence</p>	
<p>4. The CPUC has a statutory mandate in PU Code sections 451 and 364 to monitor the deployed smart grid for safety, as well as the efficiency and security, and to determine whether the electrical grid is functioning as it should function, to meet the needs of Californians. CPUC policy<sup>2</sup> is to include health and safety in EVERY proceeding, adopted in July, 2014. CPUC specifically excluded health and safety from this proceeding (and all other smart meter opt-out and smart grid proceedings). This is the subject of CEP's rehearing request for the Decision.</p>	<p>CEP opening brief, p. 13 addressed the CPUC's mandate to conduct safety reviews and inspections of the regulated utilities' electric systems. The CPUC president agreed in a statement made on January 15, 2015: <a href="http://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/New-head-of-CPUC-says-gas-safety-shortcomings-6018465.php">http://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/New-head-of-CPUC-says-gas-safety-shortcomings-6018465.php</a>. "He said <a href="#">an audit by the federal Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration</a>, which found that the agency had a two-year backlog in finishing its probes of gas explosions and other incidents, was "hard on us, but accurate."</p> <p>"We don't have consistent practices for safety enforcement record keeping," Picker said. "We don't have comprehensive training in investigation and case management, and we don't have a written enforcement policy."</p>	<p><i>See Comments.</i></p>

<sup>2</sup> The Safety Policy adopted by the CPUC on July 10, 2014, states that the Commissioners: "Certify through signature on Proposed Decisions that the findings, conclusions, and actions laid out in proceedings can meet the CPUC's overarching goals and expectations, and assure that each vote on proceedings, resolutions, ratemaking, or other decisions of the CPUC addresses the CPUC's overarching goals and expectations regarding safety and resiliency."

**B. Duplication of Effort (§ 1801.3(f) and § 1802.5):**

	<b>Intervenor's Assertion</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding? <sup>3</sup>	Yes	Yes
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Yes.
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Southern Californians for Wired Solutions to Smart Meters (SCWSSM), Peoples' Initiative Foundation (PIF), EMF Safety Network, The Town Of Fairfax; The Alliance For Human & Environmental Health; County Of Marin; City Of Marina; City Of Seaside; City Of Capitola; City Of Sta. Cruz; County Of Sta. Cruz; Town Of Ross; Consumers Power Alliance; Marin Association Of Realtors, Edward Hasbrouck, Center For Accessible Technology		Other parties included: Southern Californians for Wired Solutions to Smart Meters (SCWSSM), Peoples' Initiative Foundation (PIF), EMF Safety Network, The Town Of Fairfax; The Alliance For Human & Environmental Health; County Of Marin; City Of Marina; City Of Seaside; City Of Capitola; City Of Sta. Cruz; County Of Sta. Cruz; Town Of Ross; Consumers Power Alliance; Center For Accessible Technology
<b>d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication:</b> 1) There was duplication of effort among the parties listed in B.c. above for the issues of health effects of wireless emissions and community opt-out. 2) CEP and SCWSSM produced testimony and argued in briefs that the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) should be addressed because wireless emissions cause adverse health impacts and some people cannot have electric service at their homes because of the symptoms caused by these meters so the ADA's title II prevents the CPUC from charging fees for removing the smart meters and reading analog meters instead.		CEP substantially duplicated the efforts of other parties. Duplication occurred on Item 1, Item 2, and Item 3. This demonstrates that the parties failed to adequately

<sup>3</sup> The Division of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates effective September 26, 2013, pursuant to Senate Bill No. 96 (Budget Act of 2013: public resources), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.



<p>3) CEP also presented other issues concerning the smart meter costs that were not duplicated by other parties, including that the meters weren't being used for the purposes originally stated in the CPUC decisions ordering the program: by Decision (D.) 07-0-043 for San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&amp;E), D.08-09-039 for Southern California Edison Company (SCE), D. 06-07-027 for Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&amp;E)'s SmartMeter™ Program, and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas)'s in Application (A.) 12-05-016</p>	<p>coordinate on issues that were within the scope of the proceeding. <i>See</i> CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments, Item 1 concerning work on issues outside the scope of the proceeding. As such, we reduce CEP's claim by 50% for duplication of effort on issues within the scope of the proceeding. <i>See</i> CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments, Item 2, regarding disallowances of hours for work on issues outside the scope of the proceeding.</p>
--	--

### PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

#### A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§ 1801 and § 1806):

<p>a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness: CEP represented ratepayers who need to opt-out from having a smart meter because of health concerns. The other parties that did not represent the people who have health concerns presented testimony concerning the cost of opting out without regard to the reason for it. Public Utilities Code section 451 and the CPUC Safety Policy adopted July 10, 2014, require the CPUC to consider health impacts on the public when it issues a decision and the CPUC will not have satisfied its statutory mandate without considering CEP's testimony and arguments. CEP presented the evidence that the CPUC is statutorily mandated to consider when issuing any decision. The CPUC is not mandated to ignore PU Code section 451 requirements. Therefore, the CEP participation and contributions allow the Decision to meet statutory mandates.</p>	<p><b>CPUC Discussion</b></p> <p><i>See</i> III.D, CPUC Disallowances.</p>
--	--

<p><b>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</b></p> <p><b>See Attachment 3 for this discussion</b></p>	<p>CEP's Allocation of Hours by Issue is the following:</p> <p>GP 24.16%</p> <p>Coord 1.64%</p> <p>ADA 20.05%</p> <p>Test 22.59%</p> <p>Settle 2.13%</p> <p>EvidHear 12.76%</p> <p>Cost Brief 10.22%</p> <p>SafPolicy 1.47%</p> <p>PD 2.52%</p> <p>Rehearing 2.46%</p>
---	---

**B. Specific Claim:\***

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Martin Homec	2012	237.1	\$190	D.13-07-045	\$45,049.00	112.25	\$190	\$21,327.50
Martin Homec	2013	45.4	\$195	See comment 2 below	\$8,853.00	19.8	\$195	\$3,861.00
Martin Homec	2014	22.5	\$250	See comment 2 below	\$5,625.00	4.35	\$200	\$870.00
Martin Homec	2015	11.4	\$255	See comment 2 below	\$2,907.00	5.7	\$200	\$1,140.00
Susan Brinchman	2012	112	\$60	D.13-07-045	\$6,750.00	56	\$60	\$3,360.00
Susan Brinchman	2013	20	\$62		\$1,250.00	10	\$60	\$600.00
Susan Brinchman	2014	9	\$65		\$585.00	4.5	\$60	\$270.00
Susan Brinchman	2015	14	\$67.5		\$945.00	7	\$60	\$420.00
Subtotal: \$71,964.00						Subtotal: \$31,848.50		

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hou rs	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Martin Homec	2014	7.6	\$125	See Note 2	\$1,075.00	7.6	\$100	\$760.00
Martin Homec	2015	13.4	\$127.50		\$1,657.00	13.4	\$100	\$1,340.00
Susan Brinchman	2015	8	\$33.75		\$270.00	8	\$30	\$240.00
Subtotal: \$3,002.00						Subtotal: \$2,340.00		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
		Copying costs			\$50.64	\$0		
Subtotal: \$50.64						Subtotal: \$0.00		
TOTAL REQUEST:\$74,966.00						TOTAL AWARD:\$32,088.50		
<p>**We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor’s records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate</p>								
ATTORNEY INFORMATION								
Attorney		Date Admitted to CA BAR <sup>4</sup>			Member Number		Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?)  If “Yes”, attach explanation	
Martin Homec		May 31, 1979			085798		Yes	

<sup>4</sup> This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

**C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III**

<b>Attachment or Comment #</b>	<b>Description/Comment</b>
1	<b>Certificate of Service</b>
2	<p><b>Rate Justification for Martin Homec:</b> Mr. Homec's original rate as an attorney was set in 2009 in D.09-05-012. In that decision the Commission noted Mr. Homec's lack of legal experience before the Commission and set his rate at \$175 an hour which was the mid-range of attorneys with 0-2 years of experience in 2008. In that decision the Commission noted:</p> <p><i>"Homec has an undergraduate degree in Physics from the University of California (1970) and a law degree from the University of San Francisco (1975). He was employed as a regulatory analyst at the California Public Utilities Commission from June 1983 to October 2007. He also worked as a volunteer lawyer for the Bar Association from 1987 to 2000, representing appellants before the Immigration Appeals Board and plaintiffs in employment law at the U.S. District Court.:" D.09-05-012 at page 16.</i></p> <p><i>"Homec has no experience in practicing law before the Commission. His experience as an attorney is limited to part-time volunteer work in the fields of immigration and employment law, which ended in 2000. In light of Homec's lack of recent and relevant legal experience, we will set his 2008 hourly rate as an attorney at \$175, which mid-range for attorneys with 0 - 2 years of experience." D.09-05-012 at page 17</i></p> <p>Mr. Homec's last Commission approved rate of \$190.00 an hour was set in 2012 in D.13-07-045 which consisted of COLA adjustments from the rate set in D.09-05-012. Since 2009 when Mr. Homec's rate was first set he has been a regular practitioner before the Commission and he has gained experience.</p> <p>The Commission has approved COLA increases for attorneys in 2013 of 2% and 2014 of 2.58%. When applied to Mr. Homec's presently set rate in the 0-2 year experience range his rate would be \$195 an hour in 2013, and \$200 an hour for 2014. However, when considering that Mr. Homec's rate when set in 2009 was for an attorney with 0-2 years experience and given that Mr. Homec has practiced before the Commission on a regular basis since that time, Mr. Homec should receive a step increase as well as the COLA adjustments.</p> <p>In 2014, the year for when the work for this request was performed, the reimbursement rate for attorneys with 5-7 years experience was between \$300-\$320 an hour. CEP is not asking for that big of a rate increase, however we point out the range to show that an attorney who has been practicing before the Commission for the last several years should not have his rate remain set based on the 0-2 year experience range. For attorneys with 3-4 years experience the range for attorney</p>

	<p>reimbursement for 2014 was between \$215 and \$250 an hour.</p> <p>CEP is asking that the Commission consider raising the level of compensation for Mr. Homec to \$250 an hour. This rate would set Mr. Homec's reimbursement at the upper range of the 3-4 year experience level but not as high as an attorney in the 5-7 year experience range of \$300-\$320 an hour even though Mr. Homec has been practicing before the Commission for that length of time. CEP believes that this request is reasonable since Mr. Homec has never had a step increase, and is entitled to the COLA adjustments to his rate set in 2012. We urge the Commission to approve this rate for Mr. Homec.</p>
3	Allocation of hours by issue

#### D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:

Item	Reason
1. Disallowance for Non-Productive Work on Issues Outside of the Scope of the Proceeding.	<p>CEP's research and advocacy on health impacts of SmartMeters, safety policy, and zero opt-out charges are outside the scope of the proceedings. We disallow 32.2 hours for non-productive work on issues, which are outside of the scope of the questions posed to participants within the Scoping Memos. The following time is disallowed from Homec's hours as time spent on issues outside the scope of the proceeding:</p> <p>2012 Hours Disallowed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11/4/2012: 2.6 hours for time spent on e-mails with an EMF safety Google group.</li> <li>• 11/16/2012: 4 hours for time labels as the "Settle" cost allocation category for research of a position to support "no fees" particularly for those who fear sickness for self-meters.</li> <li>• 12/16/2012: 6 hours for time claims as "Cost Brief."</li> </ul> <p>2013 Hours Disallowed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11/18/2013: 4.8 hours for time spent to attend Senate safety hearings.</li> <li>• 11/23/2013: 1 hour for time spent on safety issues.</li> </ul> <p>2014 Hours Disallowed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7/30/2014: 3 hours for time spent on preparing a motion regarding 451 safety requirements.</li> <li>• 8/1/2014: 3.8 hours for time spent to prepare a motion regarding section 451 safety requirements.</li> <li>• On 11/1/2014: 3 hours to research the PD and compare health issues to the A.11-06-006 scoping memo and decision.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>11/3/2014: 4 hours for time spent on a conference call with EON, EMF Safety, and others on health and safety issues.</li> </ul>
2. Disallowance for duplication.	<p>We reduce the claim by 50% for duplication.</p> <p>Even though CEP represented ratepayers in Southern California, the issues were the same for Northern and Southern California. There was significant duplication, with more effective intervenors.</p>
3. Martin Homec's Hourly Rate.	<p>In 2012, CEP requests an hourly rate of \$190 for Homec, as authorized by D.13-07-045. We apply the rate of \$190 requested by CEP.</p> <p>We decline CEP's request for a higher hourly rate for Homec, but instead apply the Cost-of-Living-Adjustments (COLAs), to adopt the following rates for Homec's work in this proceeding:</p> <p>2013: \$195 (Application of 2% COLA per ALJ-287).</p> <p>2014: \$200 (Application of 2.58% COLA per ALJ-303).</p> <p>2014: \$200 (Application of 0.0% COLA per ALJ-308)</p>
4. Susan Brinchman's Hourly Rate.	<p>The Commission authorized a 2012 hourly rate for Brinchman in D.13-07-045 at \$60 per hour. We apply the Cost-of-Living-Adjustments to Brinchman's 2013, 2014, and 2015 hourly rates to adopt the following:</p> <p>2013: \$60 (Application of 2% COLA per ALJ-287)</p> <p>2014: \$60 (Application of 2.58% COLA per ALJ-303)</p> <p>2015: \$60 (Application of 0.0% COLA per ALJ-308)</p>
5. Disallowance for copying expenses.	<p>The Commission requires receipts for all costs in excess of \$20. CEP indicated there were not any receipts, and as such its copying costs for \$50.64 are denied.</p>

**PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS**

**Within 30 days after service of this Claim, Commission Staff  
or any other party may file a response to the Claim (see § 1804(c))**

<b>A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?</b>	No.
<b>B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c) (6))?</b>	No.

If not:

<b>Party</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CPUC Disposition</b>
	No comments were received.	

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Center for Electrosmog Prevention has made a substantial contribution to D.14-12-078.
2. The requested hourly rates for the Center for Electrosmog Prevention's representatives as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$32,088.50.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

**ORDER**

1. Center for Electrosmog Prevention shall be awarded \$32,088.50.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and Southern California Gas Company shall pay Center for Electrosmog Prevention their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric and

gas revenues for the 2012 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning May 3, 2015, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of the Center for Electrosmog Prevention's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at Sacramento, California.



**APPENDIX****Compensation Decision Summary Information**

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>		<b>Modifies Decision?</b>	No
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D1412078		
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	A1103014		
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Division		
<b>Payer(s):</b>	Pacific Gas and Electric, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and Southern California Gas Company		

**Intervenor Information**

<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>Claim Date</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Awarded</b>	<b>Multiplier?</b>	<b>Reason Change/Disallowance</b>
<b>Center for Electrosmog Prevention (CEP)</b>	2/17/15	\$99,093.34	\$32,088.50	N/A	Significant Disallowance for failure to provide substantial contribution on some issues; Inefficient and Unproductive Work.

**Advocate Information**

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Year Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Adopted</b>
Martin	Homec	Attorney	CEP	\$190	2012	\$190
Martin	Homec	Attorney	CEP	\$195	2013	\$195
Martin	Homec	Attorney	CEP	\$250	2014	\$200
Martin	Homec	Attorney	CEP	\$255	2015	\$200
Susan	Brinchman	Advocate	CEP	\$60	2012	\$60
Susan	Brinchman	Advocate	CEP	\$62	2013	\$60
Susan	Brinchman	Advocate	CEP	\$65	2014	\$60
Susan	Brinchman	Advocate	CEP	\$67.50	2015	\$60

**(END OF APPENDIX)**